

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are rejected under by the Examiner 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Huard et al. ('800).

The Examiner states,

"Huard et al. discloses a conventional casino game where players contribute additional bets to a random jackpot. The random jackpot can be triggered when a particular card is drawn, a particular set of cards are drawn, or a particular player is selected."

The Examiner concludes,

"Accordingly, Huard et al. discloses a method on wagering on a game of chance, which can be a card game such as poker, 21, baccarat, roulette or craps. A community event, such as the draw of a particular card, particular set of cards or selection of a particular player is then identified. The players accept wagers on the community event. Chance events are then generated by the normal play of the card game at hand. When the community event is triggered, the player triggering the event is awarded a jackpot from a prize pool."

Applicants' independent claims 1, 13, 17 and 18 include a step not disclosed or suggested by the cited Huard et al. '800 reference.

In all of Applicants' independent claims 1, 13, 17, and 18 as now amended, the event pay out is based on the amount of the player's wager such that those who bet more win more and those that bet less win less. In particular, the independent claims include the step from cancelled claims 6 and 7, i.e., basing the determining the reward of each player on the proportion of the fraction of total wagers made by all the wagering players during that game of chance that the amount of the player's wager represented.

Huard et al, '800 ties the amount paid out to many factors and not one of those would have anticipated Applicants' pay out as a function of the amount each player individually wagered. The pay out in Huard et al. '800 is based on the



jackpot, that is the collected from extra wagers to participate in the auxiliary game. Even wherein the Huard et al. '800 pay out is a percentage of the jackpot, the amount bet by each player has to be credits not from individual bet made. Moreover, only the Applicants' claimed method affords each player the added incentive of making the underlying wager greater to win more on the community event bet.

Rejected independent claims 1, 13, 17 and 18 have been amended. All pending claims have been directly or indirectly distinguished and/or amended, the cited reference has been explained and the claims and reference have been made clear relative to the Examiner's rejections. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there are any issues that the Examiner wishes to discuss, the undersigned stands ready to resolve them and make all Applicants' pending claims allowable.

On behalf of the Applicants by their attorney,



Aaron Passman Reg. No. 26,783
Mikohn Gaming Corporation
920 Pilot Road
P.O. Box 98686
Las Vegas Nevada 89193-8686
(702) 263-1613



The USPTO mailroom stamp on this postcard is Evidence that a Response to the Office Action in relation to patent application entitled: Replacement Baccarat Tie Wager, Docket No. 1999/2, USSN 09/287,556, filed April 6, 1999 was sent by Express Mail on January 11, 2001.
Express Mail No. EL373678405US.